



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

RECENT THEOLOGICAL LITERATURE

EPHOD AND ARK¹

In a number of early passages the ephod is certainly a garment, apparently an apron, or loin cloth, worn as a sacred vestment. Samuel wore an ephod when he ministered at Shiloh (I Sam. 2:18), and David wore an ephod when he danced before the ark (II Sam. 6:14). In the Priestly Code the ephod is still a garment worn by the High Priest (e.g., Exod. 29:5). In contrast to these passages the ephod appears in other contexts, not as a garment, but as a solid object made of gold, carried about by the priests and consulted by them to obtain oracles. Thus Gideon made an ephod out of 1,700 shekels of gold taken from the Midianites, which served as the medium of Yahwe's rule at Ophrah (Judg. 8:22-27). Micah made a silver ephod, which was an instrument of divination at his sanctuary (Judg. 17:1-5; 18:5). At the temple in Nob the sword of Goliath was kept wrapped in a cloth behind the ephod (I Sam. 21:9). Throughout the Book of Samuel the priests are described as "carrying an ephod," not "wearing an ephod," as even the Revised Version and the Jewish Version still translate (I Sam. 2:28; 14:3). When Abiathar fled to David, he came down "with an ephod in his hand" (I Sam. 23:6). When David wished to ascertain the will of Yahwe, he said to the priest, "Bring hither the ephod" (I Sam. 23:9b; 30:7), and the priest by this means gave the divine response. It has been recognized generally that the latter passages cannot be reconciled with the idea that the ephod was a garment; and accordingly it has become usual to speak of an "ephod-idol" as implied in these cases.

A different solution of the problem is proposed by Professor Arnold. It starts from the fact that in I Sam. 14:18 the present Hebrew text reads: "And Saul said to Ahijah, Bring hither the sacred ark" (אֲרוֹן הָאֱלֹהִים). For this the Greek text of Vaticanus reads: "And Saul said to Ahijah, Bring hither the ephod." It has been almost universally assumed by modern critics that the Greek text of this passage is correct,

¹ *Ephod and Ark. A Study in the Records and Religion of the Ancient Hebrews.* By William R. Arnold. (Harvard Theological Studies, III.) Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1918. 170 pages.

because in the Hebrew text of the similar passages I Sam. 23:9*b*; 30:7, we read, "Bring hither the ephod"; but Arnold argues that on every principle of sound textual criticism the Hebrew of I Sam. 14:18 is to be preferred. "No slip of the pen or careless reading can have produced ארון האלהים from an original האפוד; while it is simply inconceivable that a Jewish scribe should have gone out of his way to corrupt a harmless text, and incidentally bedevil the whole orthodox theory of the religious institutions of Israel, by consciously substituting the one for the other." To the present writer it seems that this contention is entirely correct. If "ark" was the original reading, we can easily see why it should have been changed to "ephod," because it contradicted the teaching of the completed Pentateuch with regard to the nature and the uses of the ark; but if "ephod" was the original reading, then no reason appears why it should have been changed to "ark." Accordingly, on the text-critical principle that of two readings that one is to be regarded as correct which most readily explains the origin of the other, the preference in this case must be given to "ark" rather than to "ephod." "Ephod" in the Greek must then be a deliberate scribal correction of "ark" which has escaped correction in the Hebrew.

The objection to this conclusion may be raised that the ark was at this time at Kirjath Jearim (I Sam. 7:1) and remained there until David brought it to Jerusalem (II Sam., chap. 6); it cannot, therefore, have been with Saul at the battle of Michmash. This objection is not very forceful, since the ark might have been brought up temporarily to Michmash, even though Kirjath Jearim continued to be its headquarters. Professor Arnold, however, deals with this argument in a much more thoroughgoing fashion. He shows that the notion that there was only one ark is a pure assumption of Jewish tradition based upon the centralization of worship at Jerusalem inaugurated by Deuteronomy, and that the older literature shows that there were many arks, just as there were many sanctuaries. "The historical ark of Yahwe was not a unique but a manifold object, attaching to every Palestinian sanctuary that possessed a consecrated priesthood; and the theory of a single ark, corresponding to that of a single legitimate sanctuary, is the last surviving Deuteronomistic conceit in the theological science of the present day" (p. 27). "There is not a single pre-exilic reference—not even in Deuteronomy and Kings—which is actually incompatible with the hypothesis of a manifold box; whereas there are no less than five passages, besides I Sam. 14:18, which are incompatible with any other hypothesis" (p. 34).

The word which our version renders "ark" is generic and means simply "box." It is used for the coffin in which the body of Joseph was carried from Egypt (Gen. 50:26; cf. Exod. 13:19), also of the money box at the door of the Temple (II Kings 12:10 f.; II Chron. 24:8, 10 f.). In Phoenician it means "coffin." In I Sam. 3:3 we read, "And Samuel was asleep in the temple of Yahwe, where there was a sacred box." This is the correct translation of *אשר שם ארון אלֹהִים*, which does not mean, "where the ark of God was," as our version renders it. The statement implies that this particular box belonged to a genus, just as we might speak of an altar, or a communion table, in a Christian church. In I Sam. 4:3, which comes from a different document from the preceding passage, and therefore has no knowledge of the "sacred box" in 3:3, we read: "Let us procure the box [of the covenant] of Yahwe from Shiloh. . . . So the army sent to Shiloh, and caused to be transported thence the box of Yahwe Şebaoth." At the first mention of the box the author of this document finds it necessary to define it by saying that it was at Shiloh and that it belonged to Yahwe Şebaoth, or, as Professor Arnold translates it, "Yahwe Militant." This was the same box that was captured by the Philistines, was restored to Israel, and was kept in the house of Obed Edom at Kirjath Jearim (I Sam. 5:1-7:2). Inasmuch as it has already been defined in chapter 4, it was not necessary to define it again in this section, but when after a considerable interval it appears again in II Sam. 6:2, we are told that David brought up "the sacred box which was especially dedicated to Yahwe Şebaoth." Here the author finds it necessary to discriminate this sacred box from others as the one belonging to Yahwe Şebaoth, which was the name under which Yahwe had been worshiped at Shiloh.

On the other hand, in I Sam. 14:18 Saul does not say, "Bring hither the box of Yahwe Şebaoth," but merely, "Bring hither the sacred box" (*אֲרוֹן הָאֱלֹהִים*), which does not suggest in any way the identity of this box with the one that was originally at Shiloh and later at Kirjath Jearim and Jerusalem.

In I Kings 2:26 we read: "I will not put thee to death, because thou didst bear the box of Yahwe before David my father, and didst share all the sufferings which my father suffered." This box also is not called "the box of Yahwe Şebaoth," and it cannot have been the box of Shiloh, Kirjath Jearim, and Jerusalem, since Abiathar did not carry that before David at the time when he was a fugitive in the wilderness of Judah. It must have been a third box different from both of those that we have just considered.

In like manner Jer. 3:16, in an oracle delivered to the remnant of the Northern Kingdom, the prophet says: "And it shall come to pass, when you increase and multiply in the land in those days, declares Yahwe, that men will no longer speak of the 'box of Yahwe' nor will it enter their minds, nor will they invoke it, nor will they resort to it; neither will it be manufactured any more." The box here referred to cannot be the individual ark of the Temple in Jerusalem but is an institution of the northern tribes. Professor Arnold accordingly concludes that there was probably an ark, or oracular box, at every important sanctuary of ancient Israel, just as there was a holy stone, an ashera, and an altar. To the reviewer it seems that he succeeds in establishing his contention.

If then the ark was plural, there is no reason why we should not accept the reading of the Hebrew text in I Sam. 14:18, "Bring hither the sacred box." The primitive oracular use of the ark is confirmed by three other passages. In II Sam 11:11 we read: "The box and Israel and Judah are lodged in booths." Here it is assumed that the box for taking the omens habitually accompanied the army of Israel, as in I Sam. 14:18. In II Sam. 15:24-29 we are told: "And behold also Zadok and Abiathar bearing the sacred box. . . . And the king said unto Abiathar, Art thou a seer? Return to the city in peace. . . . See I will linger in the lowlands of the wilderness until word come from you to inform me. So Zadok and Abiathar took the sacred box back to Jerusalem and remained there." The point of this remark, as Professor Arnold for the first time shows clearly, is that David says to Zadok, "You are not a seer who can tell me at a distance what is happening at Jerusalem, you are only a *kôhên*, 'a diviner,' who gets responses from the sacred box. Therefore return to Jerusalem, where you can be of use to me by keeping me informed of all that takes place there, and take the sacred box back with you, which you alone know how to use." Here the ark as the physical medium of priestly divination is contrasted with the second sight of the clairvoyant. In Judg. 20:27 also we read of a sacred box of which the children of Israel inquired, Shall I again go out to battle with my brethren of Benjamin?

If these conclusions are correct it follows that "Bring hither the ephod" in the Greek text of I Sam. 14:18 is a deliberate change in the Hebrew manuscript from which the Greek was translated, in order to save the unity and sanctity of the ark as described in the Priestly Code. In that case it is probable that "Bring hither the ephod" in I Sam. 23:9b; 30:7, is due to a similar change. The original reading in both verses must have been, "Bring hither the ark," for the situation is

precisely similar to the passages that have just been considered in which the ark is the medium of divination. In like manner all the other passages in which the "solid ephod" is mentioned are open to the suspicion of having undergone a similar change. When the priests are called "carriers of the ephod" (I Sam. 2:28; 14:3), and when Abiathar comes down to David "with an ephod in his hand" the original reading was not "ephod" but "ark," for in numerous early passages the priests are said to carry the ark (e.g., II Sam. 15:24-29). The ephod of gold that Gideon made (Judg. 8:27) he "deposited" (רָצַץ) in Ophrah. The same term is used of the ark in I Sam. 5:2; II Sam. 6:17; 15:24. The Deuteronomic comment "and all Israel played the harlot after it there" indicates also that it was used for oracular purposes, as was the ark. Micah's silver ephod (Judg. 17:1-5) was "inquired of" by the priest in precisely the same manner as the ark (Judg. 18:5). At the sanctuary in Nob the "ephod" had apparently similar oracular functions (I Sam. 21:9; 22:10, 13). In all these passages, if "ark" be substituted for "ephod," the difficulties vanish, and the history at once becomes clear. The conclusion accordingly follows that the only real ephod was the loin cloth with which the priest was "girded." The "solid ephod" passages, therefore, should be added to those in which the ark is mentioned in early literature in forming our idea of the nature and uses of the ancient Israelite ark.

The אֲרוֹן אֱלֹהִים, or "sacred box," was a Canaanite institution found probably at every important sanctuary. When these sanctuaries were appropriated to the service of Yahwe, their "sacred boxes" were called "boxes of Yahwe." They were regarded as miniature temples, in which the deity dwelt and through which he manifested his power. Revelation was effected by means of lots that gave either an affirmative, a negative, or a neutral answer. These were drawn out by the priest who consulted the oracle. The box was small enough to be carried by a single priest, but occasionally it was carried by two priests. It accompanied the priests wherever they went, and was the medium by which they gave their *tôrôth*, or oracular decisions.

The discussion of all the passages involved in this study is accompanied with an elaborate text-critical and exegetical commentary that is of the greatest value in elucidating many obscure points in the earlier historical books. An excursus investigates the meaning of the divine name יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת, Yahwe Šebaoth. Professor Arnold rightly points out that, inasmuch as there is no article with Šebaoth, this name cannot be translated "Yahwe of the hosts," referring either to the armies of

Israel or to the armies of heaven. He maintains that the genitive must be taken in an adjectival sense as in **שָׂר צְבָאוֹת**, "military commander," over against **שָׂר צְבָא**, "a commander in chief," and **שָׂר הַצְבָּא**, "the commander in chief," so that the title means "Yahwe Militant." The difficulty with this view is that Yahwe, being a proper name, is definite and therefore cannot be construed before **צְבָא** in the same manner as **שָׂר**. It would seem as though it were necessary to regard **צְבָאוֹת** as in apposition with **יְהוָה**, like **אֱלֹהִים** in the combination **יְהוָה אֱלֹהִים**. A second excursus, which bears no relation to the foregoing discussion, investigates a troublesome passage in the Elephantine Temple Papyrus.

Taking it as a whole, this treatise on the ephod and ark is the most important study of these subjects that has yet appeared. It clarifies our thought in a way that no other critic has hitherto succeeded in doing.

LEWIS BAYLES PATON

HARTFORD THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
HARTFORD, CONN.

THE BOOK OF DANIEL¹

Doctor Wilson essays the thankless, and to many it will seem hopeless, task of rehabilitating the authenticity and historical character of the Book of Daniel. He is convinced in the case of this book "that the methods pursued by many so-called higher critics are illogical, irrational, and unscientific" (p. xiii). After this warning we might expect that his own discussion would be unimpeachably logical, rational, and scientific. As a matter of fact it is characterized by a most perverse critical method. After a few preliminary remarks on the argument from silence, he plunges at once into the question, Was Daniel a historical character? and then takes up a number of particular historical difficulties in the Book of Daniel. A "so-called higher critic" would think that there were several preliminary questions to be answered before the historicity of the Book of Daniel could be investigated. To this "illogical, irrational, and unscientific" individual it would seem that the trustworthiness of a book depended upon its composite or unitary character, its age, its authorship, its use of reliable sources, and similar antecedent facts. Is Daniel a historical personage? Are the statements of his book that are unsupported by external evidence trustworthy? These are problems whose solution depends upon our answer to the earlier question,

¹ *Studies in the Book of Daniel. A Discussion of the Historical Questions.* By Robert Dick Wilson. New York: Putnam, 1917. xvi+402 pages. \$3.50.